UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,069	03/31/2004	Mlhai Florin Ionescu	24207-10108	5508

62296   7590   07/02/2008
GOOGLE / FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA ST.
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
MYINT, DENNIS Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/814,069	IONESCU, MLHAI FLORIN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DENNIS MYINT	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/04/2008*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In view of the Pre-Appeal Brief filed on March 18, 2008, PROSECUTION

IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of

the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply

under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31

followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of

appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however,

the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were

previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased

fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by

signing below.

/Mohammad Ali/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169

_____

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, and 14-36 have been

considered but are not moot in view of new ground(s) of rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering

patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that

the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any

inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a

later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35

U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Doganata (hereinafter "Doganata", U.S. Patent

Application Publication Number 2003/0220913) in view of Berg et al., (hereinafter

"Berg", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0120456).

As per claim 1, Doganata teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and*

PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110 ; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user*

queries are generated, information sources are queried);

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received"

(Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query***

within the context of "computer language",; and Paragraph 0022, i.e.,   *The new*

*user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, which is given*

*its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a***

***user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to*

associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query,

then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are

also associated with the query; and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match,*);

(c) "if the search query has been previously entered" (Doganata,

Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query** within the*

context of "computer language"),

(i) retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the

search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used*

*this query within the context of "computer language," then **only "computer***

***languages" is returned** as the category).*

Doganata does not explicitly teach the limitations:

(ii) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" and

(d) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query" .

On the other hand, Berg teaches the limitations:

(ii) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" (Berg, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *The identification of **the search key** and the*

***saving** of **the media signal results in two media signals**, i.e., the media*

*signals 10, 20, **being stored. The media signal 20 is compared with the***

***initially stored media signal 10.** The **parts** of the **two media signals** 10, 20*

*that are identical, or **close to identical**, are treated as if they are free from*

*undesired signal components and therefore **represent at least part of the***

desired source material. This could be, e.g., part of or a whole desired

***song**, without any interfering talk or commercials. In this case, a segment 106 of*

*the signal 10 is identical to a segment 206 of the signal 20. **The common***

***segment may be saved** for later use, for example, **to be listened to.** The*

segments before and after the segments 106, 206 where the media signals 10,

20 are not matching or identical are assumed to represent undesirable signal

components. More particularly, segment 106 may be stored in memory and be

added to by future iterations until the entire desired source material 12 has been

stored in the final memory or a threshold value for termination is reached. The

segment 106 of the source material 12 is, in this way, available for playing and

the segment 106 has an identified end 109 and an identified beginning 107) and

(d) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated

with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search

query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with

the search query as a search result of the search query (Berg, Paragraph 0033,

i.e., *The identification of* **the search key** *and the* **saving** *of* **the media signal**

results in two media signals, *i.e., the media signals 10, 20,* **being stored. The**

media signal 20 is compared with the initially stored media signal 10. *The*

parts *of the* **two media signals** *10, 20 that are identical, or* **close to identical,**

are treated as if they are free from undesired signal components and therefore

represent at least part of the desired source material. This could be, e.g.,

part of or a whole desired song, *without any interfering talk or commercials. In*

this case, a segment 106 of the signal 10 is identical to a segment 206 of the

signal 20. **The common segment may be saved** *for later use, for example,* **to**

be listened to. *The segments before and after the segments 106, 206 where the*

media signals 10, 20 are not matching or identical are assumed to represent

undesirable signal components. More particularly, segment 106 may be stored in

memory and be added to by future iterations until the entire desired source

material 12 has been stored in the final memory or a threshold value for

termination is reached. The segment 106 of the source material 12 is, in this way,

available for playing and the segment 106 has an identified end 109 and an

identified beginning 107)". Note herein that "search key" is a query.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata to combine

with method of Berg, which teaches determining whether a portion/portions of

data to be valid or not, so that the resultant method would determine whether at

least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search

query is a valid search result for the search query. One would have been

motivated to do so in order to provide a method/technique to identify similar

portion(s) of previously processed data/data stream (Berg 0007).

As per claim 2, Doganata in view of Berg teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously

received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received

search queries" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously***

***used this query** within the context of "computer language")*. Comparing the

search query to a list of previously received queries is inherent in said disclosure

of Doganata, i.e., Paragraph 0033 of Doganata.

As per claim 3, Doganata in view of Berg teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that a portion of the result set includes a change (Doganata, Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list 161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170 updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as described below in reference to FIG. 3*). Note that the category is updated because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes changes.

As per claim 8, Doganata in view of Berg teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: client-side articles, and network articles" (Doganata, Paragraph 0003, i.e., *text document;* Paragraph 0025, i.e., *a document,*).

As per claim 9, Sommerer in view of Berg teaches the limitation:

" wherein the search query comprises at least one of the following: an implicit query, an explicit query, both an implicit query and an explicit query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated*

automatically from the keywords that represent a category; and Paragraph 0020,

i.e., *The categories effectively allow **a user query to be expanded** into a*

number of keywords).

As per claim 10, Doganata in view of Berg teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set associated with at least one of

the following: a real-time event, a historical event, **an indexable event**, a non-

indexable event" (Doganata, Paragraph 0039, i.e., *the document retriever 140*

***catalogs** results from each of the information source 180).*

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

6.   Claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Berg and further in view of

Baidya et al., (hereinafter "Baidya", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number

2003/0046311).

        As per claim 4, Doganata in view of Berg does not explicitly teach the

limitation: "wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set of the

search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has

elapsed from a time associated with the result set".

        Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set meets at least one condition comprises determining whether a preset

amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set" (Baidya,

Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information;* Paragraph 0020,

i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a*

periodic basis; and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by*

the BioNews Engine; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine*

includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made

available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database; and

Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph

0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata in view of

Berg, which caches previously visited web content, to combine with the method

of Baidya, which updates caches of web content on periodic basis, so that the

resultant method would determine whether a preset amount of time has elapsed

from a time associated with the result set. One would have been motivated to do

so because *there is a need for a method and system for automatically, or semi-*

atomically, categorizing and classifying large volumes of information and keeping

the information up to date so that it is current and reliable (Baidya, Paragraph

0012).

As per claim 5, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya
teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored
result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the
search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has
elapsed from a date associated with the result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e.,
automatically updating the information; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information*
previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis;
and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews*
Engine; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an*
automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available
on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database; and Paragraph
0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055,
Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 6, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya
teaches the limitation:

"wherein retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the
search query comprises at least one of the following: retrieving the result set from
an optical disc, retrieving a result set from a hard drive, retrieving the result set
from an external data storage medium, retrieving a result set from an external
data storage reader, and retrieving a result set from   a data store on the client-

side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*).

As per claim 7, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information **offline** *).

As per claim 11, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

"If the search query has not been previously received" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The **new user query** may be based on a previously entered user query, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query*)

(i) receiving a new result set (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the*

ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query; Paragraph

0023, i.e., *The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results*

are analyzed for ranking);

(ii) "storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-accessible

data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak*

InfoBase CD containing data and instructions; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows*

users to search for information **offline**); and

(iii) "indexing the result and the search query for subsequent retrieval of

the new result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0050, i.e., *thereafter, categorize and*

index the information for storage in the InfoBase).

As per claim 14, Doganata in view of Berg teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a new result set comprises performing a search for

articles in response to the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *The*

keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed

for ranking).

As per claim 15, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitation:

" wherein storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-

accessible data store comprises at least one of the following: storing the result

set on an optical disc, storing the result set on a hard drive, storing the result set

on an external data storage medium, storing the result set on an external data

storage reader, and storing the result set on a data store on the client-side"
(Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and
instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information
offline*).

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it set forth the
claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and
rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it set forth the
claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and
rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

As per claim 22, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya
teaches the limitation:

" wherein the program code for retrieving a previously stored result set
associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following:
program code for retrieving the result set from an optical disc, program code for
retrieving a result set from a hard drive, program code for retrieving the result set
from an external data storage medium, program code for retrieving a result set
from an external data storage reader, and program code for retrieving a result set
from a data store on the client-side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak
InfoBase CD containing data and instructions).*

As per claim 23, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein the program code for receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information **offline**).*

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 30 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

7.   Claims 29 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya and

further in view of Denny et al., (hereinafter "Denny") (U.S. Patent Number

7082428).

        As per claim 29, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of in view of

Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitation: "comparing the search query to a

list of previously received search queries"

        On the other hand, Denny teaches the limitation:

        "comparing the search query to a list of previously received search

queries" (Denny, Abstract).

        At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of comparing current queries

to pervious queries, as taught by Denny, to the method of Doganata in view of

Berg and further in view of in view of Baidya so that the resultant method would

compare current queries to the previous queries. One would have been

motivated to do so in order to do away with *multiple duplicative searches* (Denny,

Column 1 Lines 62-67).

        As per claim 34, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of in view of

Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitations:

        (a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and*

PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110 ; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user*

queries are generated, information sources are queried) ;

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received"

(Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has* **previously used this query**

within the context of "computer language",; and Paragraph 0022, i.e.,   *The new*

user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, *which is given*

its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a**

user query that has no corresponding category, *then it is beneficial to*

associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query,

then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are

also associated with the query; and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match;*

and Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with*

the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is

substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the

results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar

result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources);

(c) "if the search query has not been previously received,

(i) receiving the first result set" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application*

server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the

application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query,

the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously

executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed

against one or more data sources);

(ii) "storing the first result set in an offline-accessible data store"

(Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(iii) "indexing the first result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(d) "if the search query has been previously received" (Denny, Abstract,),

(i) "retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used this query within the context of "computer language," then **only "computer languages" is returned** as the category*);

(il) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" (Berg Paragraph 0033 as applied to claim 1 above. Doganata, Paragraph 0024);

(iil) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set" (Berg Paragraph 0033 as applied to claim 1 above); and

(iv) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined not to be a valid search result set for the search query" (Berg Paragraph 0033 as applied to claim 1 above),

(1) "receiving the second result set" (Denny, Abstract; The method of Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) "storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(3) "indexing the second result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya,

Paragraph 0151).

As per claim 35, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of in view of

Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously

received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received

search queries" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an*

entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server

finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application

server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no

substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more

data sources).

As per claim 36, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of in view of

Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously

stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for

the search query comprises determining at least **one of the following**:

determining that a portion of the previously result set is new, determining that a

portion of the previously stored result set includes a change, determining that a

new article exists in a category of the previously stored result set, determining

that a new article has been received in a category of the previously stored result

set, determining that an article has been changed in the previously stored result

set, determining that a new email has been received in a category of the

previously stored result set, determining that a new email has been sent in a

category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new web page has

been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a

web page has been changed in a category of the previously stored result set,

determining that a new document has been received in a category of the

previously stored result set, and determining that a new document has been

generated in a category of the previously stored result set" (Doganata,

Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list*

161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the

associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the

ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170

updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as

described below in reference to FIG. 3). Note that the category is updated

because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes

changes),

        (1) "receiving the second result set" (Denny, Abstract; The method of

Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

        (2) "storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store"

(Baidya, Paragraph 0151*)*.

8.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Rivers-

Moore et al, (hereinafter "Rivers", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number

2004/0267813).

        As per claim 33, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitations:

        "receiving a request for an article, the article being accessible via a

network" (Doganata, Figure 1; Paragraph 0028, i.e., *Internet databases, Internet*

search engines or public or private databases);

        "determining whether the article is valid" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e.,

*If the user has **previously used this query** within the context of "computer*

language");

        "if the article is determined not to be valid, retrieving the article via the

network" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039,

i.e., if the query is new, that is, the query was not entered/received before; See

claim 1 for details);

        "retrieving the article via the network" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024,

Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039);

        "outputting the article on the client device" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024,

i.e., *the present invention has the ability to return **a higher percentage of***

***relevant documents** to the user)*;

"if the article is not stored in the offline-accessible data store" (Baidya,

Paragraph 0050k i.e., *Back-End Processing Engine*). Note that most of Baidya's

method and system are implemented online, i.e., data is not stored in offline-

accessible. Only in Paragraph 0515, Baidya recites an alternative embodiment

wherein data is stored in offline-accessible store.

Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya not explicitly teach

the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data

store   associated with the client device"; and "if the article is stored in an

offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving the article from the offline-

accessible data store";

Rivers teaches the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data

store   associated with the client device" (Rivers Paragraph 0088, i.e.,

determine if the solution is available locally for offline use); and

"if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving

the article from the offline-accessible data store" (Rivers Paragraph 0089, i.e., *to*

determine if the solution 124 is on the computer (cached or available offline) and

access the solution).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining whether data is

stored in an offline-accessible or not, as taught by Rivers, to the method and

system of Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya so that the

resultant method and system would determine if the data is stored in offline store

or not. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently gather

electronic information (Rivers, Paragraph 0011).

9.   Claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya and

further in view Shaath et al., (hereinafter "Shaath") (U.S. Patent Application

Publication Number 20060010150).

        As per claim 12, Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya does

not explicitly teach the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result set".

        Shaath teaches the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result

set" (Paragraph 0030, i.e., *it will expire;* Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;* and

Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date).*

        At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining expiration

data, taught by Shaath, to method of Doganata in view of Berg and further in

view of Baidya so that the resultant method would determine expiration data.

One would have been motivated to do so because determining expiration data is

notoriously well know in the art.

        As per claim 16, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya

and further in view of Shaath teaches the limitation:

"wherein (f) determining expiration data for the result set comprises

determining expiration data for at least a portion of the result set, and displaying

the expiration data for the at least a portion of the result set" (Shaath, Paragraph

0102, *expiration dates;* and Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration*

date; and 0032, i.e., *completely transparent to the user*).

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 12 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 32 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

10.   Claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Doganata (hereinafter "Doganata", U.S. Patent

Application Publication Number 2003/0220913) in view of Inaba et al.,

(hereinafter "Inaba", U.S. Patent Number 7054860).

As per claim 1, Doganata teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and*

PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110 ; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user*

queries are generated, information sources are queried);

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received"

(Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query***

within the context of "computer language",; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The new*

*user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, which is given*

*its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a***

***user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to*

associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query,

then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are

also associated with the query; and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match,*);

(c) "if the search query has been previously entered" (Doganata,

Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query** within the*

context of "computer language"),

(i) retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the

search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used*

this query within the context of "computer language," then **only "computer**

languages" is returned *as the category*).

Doganata does not explicitly teach the limitations:

(ii) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search

query" and

(d) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated

with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search

query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with

the search query as a search result of the search query" .

On the other hand, Inaba teaches the limitations:

(ii) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search

query" (Inaba Figure 1, i.e., *Search Result File Group 129;* Inaba Column 6

Lines 31-34, i.e., *Next, in step 681, the* **similar document-searching** *program*

115 is started to perform a document search on the basis of the searching profile

generated in the step 601 and display a search result; Inaba Column 5 Lines 3-5,

i.e., *As will be described later, the search result history file group 129 is a* **set of**

files each saving a search result presented to the user each time *that*

retrieval is carried out; Inaba Column 6 Lines 35-52, i.e., *Thereafter, in step 682,*

the search history saving program 118 is started by inputting user operation

*information "the seed document is set", and the searching profile and **the search***

***result are saved in a file of the searching profile saving file group 128** and a*

file of the search result history saving file group 129, respectively. The user

operation information referred to herein is a string expressing the content of a

user operation such as "the seed document is set" or "a document of document

*number 10 is evaluated **as desirable"**. Through the present step, the searching*

profile at present and the search result based on the searching profile are saved.

Further, the searching profile at present, the search result based on the

searching profile and the user operation information "the seed document is set"

are all registered as initial information in the search history table 126 by making

the correspondence between them. The concrete contents of data saved in the

search history table 126 will be described later with reference to FIG. 16; Inaba

Colum 6 Lines 63 through Column 7 Line 57, i.e., Subsequently, when the

command is determined to be a command to input a user's evaluation for the

search result document in the step 606, the searching profile updating program

*116 is started in step 651 to generate user operation information **on the basis of***

***the evaluation inputted by the user** and change the content of the searching*

profile saving area 124. Further, in step 652, the similar document-searching

*program 115 is started to perform document search **on the basis of the content***

***of the searching profile changed** in the step 651 and **display a search result**.*

Furthermore, in step 653, the search history saving program 118 is started by

*using the user operation information generated in the step 651 as an input **to***

***save**, in the search history table 126, the searching profile changed in the step*

651 and **the search result obtained in the step 652** *by making the*

correspondence of them with the user operation information).

(d) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated

with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search

query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with

the search query as a search result of the search query" (Inaba Figure 1, i.e.,

Search Result File Group 129; Inaba Column 6 Lines 31-34, i.e., *Next, in step*

681, the **similar document-searching** *program 115 is started to perform a*

document search on the basis of the searching profile generated in the step 601

and display a search result; Inaba Column 5 Lines 3-5, i.e., *As will be described*

later, the search result history file group 129 is a **set of files each saving a**

search result presented to the user each time *that retrieval is carried out;*

Inaba Column 6 Lines 35-52, i.e., *Thereafter, in step 682, the search history*

saving program 118 is started by inputting user operation information "the seed

document is set", and the searching profile and **the search result are saved in a**

file of the searching profile saving file group 128 *and a file of the search*

result history saving file group 129, respectively. The user operation information

referred to herein is a string expressing the content of a user operation such as

"the seed document is set" or "a document of document number 10 is evaluated

as desirable"*. Through the present step, the searching profile at present and the*

search result based on the searching profile are saved. Further, the searching

profile at present, the search result based on the searching profile and the user

operation information "the seed document is set" are all registered as initial

information in the search history table 126 by making the correspondence

between them. The concrete contents of data saved in the search history table

126 will be described later with reference to FIG. 16; Inaba Colum 6 Lines 63

through Column 7 Line 57, i.e., *Subsequently, when the command is determined*

to be a command to input a user's evaluation for the search result document in

the step 606, the searching profile updating program 116 is started in step 651 to

*generate user operation information **on the basis of the evaluation inputted by***

***the user** and change the content of the searching profile saving area 124.*

Further, in step 652, the similar document-searching program 115 is started to

*perform document search **on the basis of the content of the searching profile***

***changed** in the step 651 and **display a search result**. Furthermore, in step 653,*

the search history saving program 118 is started by using the user operation

*information generated in the step 651 as an input **to save**, in the search history*

*table 126, the searching profile changed in the step 651 and **the search result***

***obtained in the step 652** by making the correspondence of them with the user*

operation information).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata to combine

with method of Inaba, which teaches determining whether a portion/portions of

data to be valid or not, so that the resultant method would determine whether at

least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search

query is a valid search result for the search query. One would have been

motivated to do so in order to provide a method/technique to "realize

improvements in the retrieval accuracy by making it possible to recommence

evaluation for a desired search result document" (Inaba Column 2 Lines 60-64).

As per claim 2, Doganata in view of Inaba teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously

received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received

search queries" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously***

***used this query** within the context of "computer language"*). Comparing the

search query to a list of previously received queries is inherent in said disclosure

of Doganata, i.e., Paragraph 0033 of Doganata.

As per claim 3, Doganata in view of Inaba teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the

query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that a

portion of the result set includes a change (Doganata, Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The*

information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list 161 of information sources

180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the associated query and category.

When the linguistic library 170 receives the ranked list of information sources 180

through link 161, the linguistic library 170 updates the category with the ranked

list 161 of information sources 180, as described below in reference to FIG. 3;

See also, ; Inaba Colum 6 Lines 63 through Column 7 Line 57, i.e.,

*Subsequently, when the command is determined to be a command to input a user's evaluation for the search result document in the step 606, the searching profile updating program 116 is started in step 651 to generate user operation information **on the basis of the evaluation inputted by the user** and change the content of the searching profile saving area 124. Further, in step 652, the similar document-searching program 115 is started to perform document search **on the basis of the content of the searching profile changed** in the step 651 and **display a search result**. Furthermore, in step 653, the search history saving program 118 is started by using the user operation information generated in the step 651 as an input **to save**, in the search history table 126, the searching profile changed in the step 651 and **the search result obtained in the step 652** by making the correspondence of them with the user operation information).* Note that the category is updated because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes changes.

As per claim 8, Doganata in view of Inaba teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: client-side articles, and network articles" (Doganata, Paragraph 0003, i.e., *text document;* Paragraph 0025, i.e., *a document,*).

As per claim 9, Sommerer in view of Inaba teaches the limitation:

" wherein the search query comprises at least one of the following: an

implicit query, an explicit query, both an implicit query and an explicit query"

(Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated*

automatically from the keywords that represent a category; and Paragraph 0020,

i.e., *The categories effectively allow* **a user query to be expanded** *into a*

number of keywords).

As per claim 10, Doganata in view of Inaba teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set associated with at least one of

the following: a real-time event, a historical event, **an indexable event**, a non-

indexable event" (Doganata, Paragraph 0039, i.e., *the document retriever 140*

catalogs *results from each of the information source 180).*

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

11.   Claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of Baidya et al., (hereinafter "Baidya", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0046311).

As per claim 4, Doganata in view of Inaba does not explicitly teach the limitation: "wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set of the

search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has

elapsed from a time associated with the result set".

Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set meets at least one condition comprises determining whether a preset

amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set" (Baidya,

Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information;* Paragraph 0020,

i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a*

periodic basis; and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by*

the BioNews Engine; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine*

includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made

available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database; and

Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph

0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata in view of

Inaba, which caches previously visited web content, to combine with the method

of Baidya, which updates caches of web content on periodic basis, so that the

resultant method would determine whether a preset amount of time has elapsed

from a time associated with the result set. One would have been motivated to do

so because *there is a need for a method and system for automatically, or semi-*

atomically, categorizing and classifying large volumes of information and keeping

the information up to date so that it is current and reliable (Baidya, Paragraph

0012).

As per claim 5, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the

search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has

elapsed from a date associated with the result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e.,

automatically updating the information; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information*

previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis;

and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews*

Engine; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an*

automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available

on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database; and Paragraph

0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055,

Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 6, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitation:

"wherein retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the

search query comprises at least one of the following: retrieving the result set from

an optical disc, retrieving a result set from a hard drive, retrieving the result set

from an external data storage medium, retrieving a result set from an external

data storage reader, and retrieving a result set from   a data store on the client-

side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and*

instructions).

As per claim 7, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following:

receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device,

receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device"

(Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and*

instructions; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information*

offline).

As per claim 11, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitations:

"If the search query has not been previously received" (Doganata,

Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The **new user query** may be based on a previously*

entered user query, which is given its own personal category or is related to a

*general category. **If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding***

***category**, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a*

category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the

ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query)

(i) receiving a new result set (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* Paragraph 0023, i.e., *The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for ranking*);

(ii) "storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information **offline***); and

(iii) "indexing the result and the search query for subsequent retrieval of the new result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0050, i.e., *thereafter, categorize and index the information for storage in the InfoBase*).

As per claim 14, Doganata in view of Inaba teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a new result set comprises performing a search for articles in response to the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for ranking*).

As per claim 15, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

" wherein storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-accessible data store comprises at least one of the following: storing the result

set on an optical disc, storing the result set on a hard drive, storing the result set

on an external data storage medium, storing the result set on an external data

storage reader, and storing the result set on a data store on the client-side"

(Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and

instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information*

offline).

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it set forth the

claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and

rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

As per claim 22, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitation:

" wherein the program code for retrieving a previously stored result set

associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following:

program code for retrieving the result set from an optical disc, program code for

retrieving a result set from a hard drive, program code for retrieving the result set

from an external data storage medium, program code for retrieving a result set

from an external data storage reader, and program code for retrieving a result set

from a data store on the client-side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions).*

As per claim 23, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein the program code for receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information **offline**).*

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 30 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

12.   Claims 29 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of Baidya and

further in view of Denny et al., (hereinafter "Denny") (U.S. Patent Number

7082428).

As per claim 29, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of in view

of Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitation: "comparing the search query to

a list of previously received search queries"

On the other hand, Denny teaches the limitation:

"comparing the search query to a list of previously received search

queries" (Denny, Abstract).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of comparing current queries

to pervious queries, as taught by Denny, to the method of Doganata in view of

Inaba and further in view of in view of Baidya so that the resultant method would

compare current queries to the previous queries. One would have been

motivated to do so in order to do away with *multiple duplicative searches* (Denny,

Column 1 Lines 62-67).

As per claim 34, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of in view

of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and*

PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110 ; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user*

queries are generated, information sources are queried) ;

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received"

(Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query***

within the context of "computer language",; and Paragraph 0022, i.e.,　*The new*

*user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, which is given*

*its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a***

***user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to*

associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query,

then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are

also associated with the query; and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match;*

and Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with*

the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is

substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the

results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar

result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources);

(c) "if the search query has not been previously received,

(i) receiving the first result set" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application*

server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the

application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query,

the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously

executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed

against one or more data sources);

(ii) "storing the first result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(iii) "indexing the first result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(d) "if the search query has been previously received" (Denny, Abstract,),

(i) "retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used this query within the context of "computer language," then **only "computer languages" is returned** as the category*);

(iI) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" (Inaba as applied to claim 1 above);

(iiI) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set" (Inaba as applied to claim 1 above); and

(iv) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined not to be a valid search result set for the search query" (Inaba as applied to claim 1 above),

(1) "receiving the second result set" (Denny, Abstract; The method of Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) "storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(3) "indexing the second result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

As per claim 35, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources*).

As per claim 36, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that a portion of the previously result set is new, determining that a portion of the previously stored result set includes a change, determining that a

new article exists in a category of the previously stored result set, determining

that a new article has been received in a category of the previously stored result

set, determining that an article has been changed in the previously stored result

set, determining that a new email has been received in a category of the

previously stored result set, determining that a new email has been sent in a

category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new web page has

been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a

web page has been changed in a category of the previously stored result set,

determining that a new document has been received in a category of the

previously stored result set, and determining that a new document has been

generated in a category of the previously stored result set" (Doganata,

Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list*

161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the

associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the

ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170

updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as

described below in reference to FIG. 3). Note that the category is updated

because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes

changes),

(1) "receiving the second result set" (Denny, Abstract; The method of

Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) "storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store"

(Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

13.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of Baidya and further in view of

Rivers-Moore et al, (hereinafter "Rivers", U.S. Patent Application Publication

Number 2004/0267813).

As per claim 33, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya

teaches the limitations:

"receiving a request for an article, the article being accessible via a

network" (Doganata, Figure 1; Paragraph 0028, i.e., *Internet databases, Internet*

search engines or public or private databases);

"determining whether the article is valid" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e.,

*If the user has **previously used this query** within the context of "computer*

language");

"if the article is determined not to be valid, retrieving the article via the

network" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039,

i.e., if the query is new, that is, the query was not entered/received before; See

claim 1 for details);

"retrieving the article via the network" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024,

Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039);

"outputting the article on the client device" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024,

i.e., *the present invention has the ability to return **a higher percentage of***

***relevant documents** to the user*);

"if the article is not stored in the offline-accessible data store" (Baidya,

Paragraph 0050k i.e., *Back-End Processing Engine*). Note that most of Baidya's

method and system are implemented online, i.e., data is not stored in offline-

accessible. Only in Paragraph 0515, Baidya recites an alternative embodiment

wherein data is stored in offline-accessible store.

Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya not explicitly teach

the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data

store   associated with the client device"; and "if the article is stored in an

offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving the article from the offline-

accessible data store";

Rivers teaches the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data

store   associated with the client device" (Rivers Paragraph 0088, i.e.,

determine if the solution is available locally for offline use); and

"if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving

the article from the offline-accessible data store" (Rivers Paragraph 0089, i.e., *to*

determine if the solution 124 is on the computer (cached or available offline) and

access the solution).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining whether data is

stored in an offline-accessible or not, as taught by Rivers, to the method and

system of Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya so that the

resultant method and system would determine if the data is stored in offline store

or not. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently gather

electronic information (Rivers, Paragraph 0011).

14.   Claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya and

further in view Shaath et al., (hereinafter "Shaath") (U.S. Patent Application

Publication Number 20060010150).

As per claim 12, Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya does

not explicitly teach the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result set".

Shaath teaches the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result

set" (Paragraph 0030, i.e., *it will expire;* Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;* and

Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date).*

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining expiration

data, taught by Shaath, to method of Doganata in view of Inaba and further in

view of Baidya so that the resultant method would determine expiration data.

One would have been motivated to do so because determining expiration data is

notoriously well know in the art.

As per claim 16, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Shaath teaches the limitation:

"wherein (f) determining expiration data for the result set comprises determining expiration data for at least a portion of the result set, and displaying the expiration data for the at least a portion of the result set" (Shaath, Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;* and Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date;* and 0032, i.e., *completely transparent to the user*).

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 12 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 32 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Contact Information

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is

(571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM

Monday-Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

/C. T. T./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

Dennis Myint
Examiner
AU-2162